

looking ahead

A monthly report by the National Planning Association on forward-looking policy planning and research—announced, underway, and completed—of importance to the nation's future

Vol. 8, No. 2

March 1960

Needed: A New Look at Our Social Science Curriculum

Education for the World Responsibilities of the United States

by Theodore Geiger

Chief of International Studies, NPA

The following is the text of an address delivered by Dr. Geiger before the Washington Chapter of the Educational Press Association of America at a luncheon held on March 24, 1960.

SINCE WORLD WAR II, the United States has had to assume worldwide responsibilities of unprecedented scope and seriousness. As the largest, wealthiest, and strongest of the Western nations, the United States is expected to provide leadership in ensuring the freedom and welfare of the Western community, in fostering the economic development of the poorer countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and in meeting the threat—military, economic, and ideological—of the imperial communist powers, the Soviet Union and Red China. These are formidable responsibilities for a nation which, until the present generation, has always preferred—and has almost always been able—to isolate itself from the temptations and dangers of active participation in world politics.

While the problem confronting Americans today is how to carry out these tasks more effectively, it is remarkable in the light of our past that the United States has made such rapid progress in meeting these enormous responsibilities. Partial and inadequate as it still is, the American performance is, nonetheless, a tribute to the understanding and determination of a people who have had to overcome not only nostalgia for their comfortable isolationist past but also the distraction of an unparalleled domestic prosperity and euphoria.

Yet, no thoughtful American would deny that our present performance abroad falls much too short both of the requirements of the international situation and of our own potentialities. Nor is there any easy or quick way to overcome this lag, for it does not arise simply from inadequate understanding of world problems and corresponding American responsibilities. Other factors—political, social, and psychological—are always involved, and are often more important than purely rational considerations.

It is apparently fashionable today to blame most, if not all, of the shortcomings of American society on the defects of American education. Such an exaggeration may be expedient in generating the degree of public attention and political will power

In This Issue—

EDUCATION FOR THE WORLD RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNITED STATES

by Theodore Geiger

CAN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY ADJUST TO ARMS CONTROL?

An NPA Joint Statement

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION

the people of NPA

A Challenge for Our Educational System

● "It is not strange that the launching of Sputnik and other developments in the technological race between Soviet imperialism and the free world should have caused a great upsurge of interest and activity in the training of college and secondary school students in natural science. But the race between economic authoritarianism and free enterprise under free government poses a challenge for our educational system that is just as sharp. It little behooves us to rest on our laurels and take it for granted that our economic system is well enough constructed, well enough understood, and well enough operated so that we can win in the economic race with Russia or achieve the Good Society fast enough and completely enough to satisfy the yearnings of our own citizens."

From a feature article by Edwin G. Nourse, member of NPA's National Council and vice chairman of the Joint Council on Economic Education, which appeared in the September 1958 issue of Looking Ahead.



necessary to remedy the deficiencies of our educational system. But, just as better understanding is only one of the essential preconditions for a more effective American performance in the world, so improved education is only one of the elements required for this better understanding. There can be little doubt, however, that it is the most important, and certainly it is the one most accessible to remedial action.

I

In the last few years, a great deal of effort has been devoted to improving the training of Americans for overseas service in government, in private business, in research, and in philanthropic activities. In the main, these schools and programs for overseas service operate at the graduate level and are designed for people who wish to specialize in one or more of the academic disciplines or applied technologies required for work or research abroad. My observations are not primarily directed to such specialized graduate training, but are more broadly related to the education of Americans generally, and particularly of our opinion leaders. Hence, they are principally concerned with the high school and undergraduate levels of our educational system.

I may add parenthetically that I strongly believe in postponing scientific, professional, and technical specialization to the graduate level and in making the undergraduate curriculum as comprehensive as possible in the humanities and the social and natural sciences. Indeed, the more specialized our advanced training becomes, the more important it is that undergraduate studies provide a broader and more diversified intellectual base.

Let me try to summarize the objective which I believe high school and undergraduate education should strive to achieve in preparing Americans to understand better the international responsibilities of the United States and to participate more effectively in carrying them out. Ideally, education should provide the American people, and especially their opinion leaders, with the concepts, the knowledge, and the methodology for comprehending the nature of the existing international system and how it got the way it is; the aims, potentialities, and limitations of the world's leading nations and regional groupings; current economic, political, and ideological trends and their probable future developments; and the implications of these factors for the international position and foreign policy of the United States.

Admittedly, this is an ambitious objective and is unlikely to be wholly achieved on any substantial scale. But, even partial achievement would be a significant and worthwhile advance over the obsolete concepts, misinformation, and plain ignorance which characterize so many Americans' notions of the world in which we live.

The question is whether the existing curriculum of the high schools and the colleges is adequate to accomplish this purpose. If not, can the deficiency be readily overcome by simply increasing the number of courses, or the number of hours, devoted to world history, international relations, and foreign languages? Or, is some more fundamental approach required to the revision of the curriculum?

I cannot presume to discuss these questions fully, much less to answer them, in these short informal remarks. Nor

can I pretend to have the intimate knowledge of the inner workings of our educational system which could be expected of the professional educator or school administrator. But, perhaps these observations may be of interest precisely because they are made from outside the system, from the rather different vantage point imposed by my own occupational perspective and concern.

I believe that it would be worthwhile to take a new look at our social science curriculum at the high school and undergraduate levels in terms of the realities of the contemporary world situation rather than of the traditional distinctions among the academic disciplines—that is, history, economics, sociology, political science, etc. Anyone who has to deal conceptually or operationally with a specific international policy problem today—for example, the desirability and feasibility of disarmament proposals, the economic development of India, the improvement of U.S.-Latin American relations, competitive coexistence with the Soviet Union—soon finds that economic, political, psychological, and ideological factors are inextricably intertwined. He must be prepared to cope with them as a whole, analytically if he can, intuitively if he must. In either case, the broader his background in the social sciences, the better will be his comprehension. The difficulty is to find a way of presenting the many-faceted nature of social phenomena which avoids the extremes either of emaciated generalizations or of indigestible masses of data.

A step toward the solution of this problem was certainly taken in the interwar period with the development of several types of interdisciplinary survey courses for undergraduates, most notably Columbia University's contemporary civilization courses and the University of Chicago's social science curriculum. Regardless of their comparative merits—and I know how bitterly controversy still rages between the partisans of Columbia and Chicago—it may be doubted whether any kind of interdisciplinary approach is sufficiently integrated to convey the organic character of real-life situations and sufficiently relevant to actual world problems and trends. Before we are satisfied to continue with the conventional interdisciplinary approaches, we should at least be willing to try the experiment of devising a new social science curriculum from an entirely different starting point—not from the traditional distinctions and entrenched interests of the academic disciplines, but from the nature of the living problems themselves and the purposes which knowledge about them is intended to serve.

II

Among the many considerations that would have to be taken into account in such a re-examination, there are two which I would like particularly to mention. They might figuratively be called the "spatial horizon" and the "time perspective" of the social science curriculum regarded within the context of trying to achieve better understanding of contemporary international problems and American responsibilities.

With respect to the spatial horizon, two observations seem relevant.

If we are to educate our children to cope effectively with the world of the second half of the twentieth century, we must, it seems to me, transcend the conventional view that world history and the history of Western civilization are

identical. Until World War II, such a restricted concept of world history accorded significantly with the facts of international relations. For centuries, world politics have indeed consisted almost exclusively of relations among the countries of Europe, and the rest of the world was significant either as the arena in which a part of the drama took place or as the spoils which fell to the strong and the venture-some among the Western nations. Today, for the first time in human history, world politics are truly global, planet-wide. The centers of international initiative are no longer confined, as they were for hundreds of years, to London, Paris, Rome, Berlin, Vienna, Moscow, and, occasionally, Washington. Other continents and other countries have now become active, indeed leading, participants, pursuing their own distinctive values and destinies.

To deal effectively with these new non-Western actors, we need to know a great deal more about their characters and expectations than most of us now do. We should know more of their histories than the fragments that have intermittently impinged on the West in the past—for example, the invasions of Attila and Genghis Khan, the discoveries of Marco Polo and Magellan, and the conquests of Cortez and Cecil Rhodes. Other peoples and countries have to be studied in their own historical perspectives, in terms of their own existing values, institutions, and expectations, and not simply as they have affected our destiny from time to time.

The second observation about the spatial horizon of our social science curriculum is that, if we wish to understand and cope effectively with others, I believe it is first necessary to know who we are, and how we got that way. Only from an adequate sense of our own identity and background can we obtain the self-confidence required to deal maturely and constructively with peoples whose characters, developments, and interests differ markedly from our own. Not only those who are specifically preparing to work or study abroad, but also Americans generally, need to have a much better grasp than they do of the origins, development, and present character of American society. I doubt whether an adequate sense of the novel and derived features of American society is conveyed by the conventional high school and undergraduate courses in American history. Many Americans, including opinion leaders, know far too little about "the American way of life," and even less about whether it can be "exported" to other peoples—a nostrum far too often prescribed for the ills of other countries.

Progress in widening the spatial horizon of our social science curriculum in these two directions would make possible courses in the comparative study of the world's leading political, economic, and social systems, certainly at the undergraduate level and perhaps even in the high schools. Hitherto, meaningful study of comparative systems has generally had to be reserved for the graduate school level, if undertaken at all. Yet, such comparative studies should be an essential part of the education of Americans generally, and not only of those who are in training for service abroad or for scholarly research.

My second general point relates to the time perspective of the social science curriculum. The problem is to allow adequate time for the study of the present without detri-

ment to the treatment of the past. An understanding of current international—and domestic—developments cannot, it seems to me, be adequately taught as the tail end of courses in world or American history. Most teachers are lucky if they can reach, much less treat effectively, the events of the interwar period. True, the high schools still have their weekly sessions on current events. But, if I can trust the reactions of my teenage children, these are apparently no more interesting, informative or comprehensive than they were 30 years ago when I was in high school.

Some new ideas would be helpful as to how the study of the present can be brought more effectively into the social science curriculum. For example, the conventional textbook is too permanent and soon ceases to be up-to-date, even when it is not yet out of date. Newspapers and magazines are too ephemeral and too superficial, even when they may not be unduly biased or incomplete. Something between the two is needed—perhaps a loose-leaf book into which new or revised units on specific current events developments could be inserted once or twice a year. Or, perhaps a monthly publication would be more useful if it were specifically designed to present the developing issues in a changing world in terms that relate them both to their historical roots and to their probable future consequences.

III

In essence, what I have been suggesting today is that it would be desirable to take a new look at the social science curriculum of our high schools and colleges from the vantage point of what Americans need to know in order to understand the world in which they live, and to support politically and participate effectively in the requisite official and private activities abroad. Viewing the subject in this perspective, we may relevantly ask such questions as: What different combinations and divisions within the social sciences might foster a better understanding of the world and of the tasks which we must perform? What would be the implications of such changes for the training of high school teachers and of undergraduate instructors? What new teaching and reference materials would have to be prepared to make these changes effective? What intellectual and financial resources would be required for all of these tasks?

Let me hasten to add that I don't know the answers to these and other related questions. I don't have a blueprint in my pocket of a new social science curriculum, nor could I produce one in short order if asked for it. All that I am trying to express is my conviction that it would be worthwhile to invest the required talents, time, and money in taking a fresh look at the problem along the lines suggested.

Such an investigation is likely to be more fruitful if those who undertake it include not only the educational experts but also knowledgeable people who have had operational, as distinct from academic, experience of contemporary world problems and American responsibilities. It is a truism of American educational philosophy that our schools and colleges should prepare their students to cope with life. We are all too familiar with the more extreme absurdities perpetrated in some of our high schools and colleges in the name of life preparation. But, even in more

sophisticated institutions, this injunction seems too often merely to be paid lip service, or if efforts are made to carry it out, they tend frequently to be conceived in terms of the rather dated problems and issues of the instructor's formative years, for example, the 1930s.

Moreover, the inclusion of some thoughtful and imaginative people from outside the educational system is all the more desirable in view of the impediments to fresh insights and new creative ideas. Not only would a fundamental re-examination of the social science curriculum be difficult in itself because of the intrinsic complexity and elusiveness of the subject; but it would also encounter certain obstacles inherent in our educational system today. These include the inertia of customary educational concepts and methods and the entrenched interests of the academic disciplines and their respective departments. The current preference for publications output over teaching ability in our institutions of higher learning and the current domination of the undergraduate curriculum by the graduate schools and of the high school curriculum by the colleges will further compound the difficulty of the task. Another obstacle—in some ways the most formidable of all—is the undue prestige of the natural sciences, and the pathetic efforts of social scientists to appear equally "scientific" by spinning out ever more esoteric or mathematical terminologies less and less relevant to the realities of social experience.

With each passing year, the consequences become more serious of the lag between American responsibilities in the world and American performance in carrying them out. At some point in the future, a persisting American failure to meet the requirements of the times could well prove fatal not only to the United States but to the entire Western community as well. Insofar as better understanding is an indispensable factor in overcoming this lag, improving our education for the world responsibilities of the United States is a national obligation that we must not continue to stint, much less try to avoid.

Today, it is heartening that educators and administrators, trustees and alumni, government officials and foundation staffs are lavishing such unprecedented solicitude and funds upon the deficiencies of our educational system. Nonetheless, I cannot but feel some concern that this effort may be overstressing the quantitative aspects of the problem—how to accommodate increasing numbers of students at all levels, recruit larger faculties and pay them more adequate (or should I say less inadequate?) salaries. Difficult as these quantitative objectives are to accomplish, they are less formidable and more definable than the task of bringing new thinking and fresh insights to bear on the improvement of curriculum, methods, and teaching staffs in our high schools and colleges to enhance both the knowledge and the understanding of their graduates.

I hope that we will not shirk the ardors and uncertainties of trying to meet these qualitative needs. Our educational system will ultimately be judged, and the fate of our country in part determined, not alone by the number of students that the high schools and colleges can process. Equally important is what they have learned in the process about themselves, their world, and the nature of the choices they will have to make and the responsibilities they will have to bear in the years to come.

—The People of NPA—

Kenneth
Holland



Fabian Bachrach

NPA International Committee member, Kenneth Holland, has made a career of promoting international understanding through educational exchange. President of the Institute of International Education (IIE) since 1950, Dr. Holland was once an IIE exchange student himself and studied in France on a scholarship. He received his undergraduate education at Occidental College in California, his Master's Degree from Princeton University, and his Faculty of Law Degree from the University of Paris.

Dr. Holland has an extensive and varied background in educational exchange. He served as permanent U. S. Representative to UNESCO in Paris from 1948-50, and was an assistant director of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs in the State Department from 1946-48. In this capacity, he developed the program of international exchange of persons, overseas libraries, and cultural institutes. In 1948, he became the first director of the State Department's Office of Educational Exchange. While with the State Department, Dr. Holland was responsible for planning the administration of the Fulbright Act, and also served as executive secretary of the Board of Foreign Scholarships appointed by the President in 1947 to direct the Fulbright program. He was president of the Inter-American Educational Foundation from 1945-46, and in this role negotiated and signed educational agreements with some sixteen other American Republics.

Dr. Holland has also contributed his knowledge and experience in educational exchange to the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs, the American National Theatre and Academy, and the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships by serving on their respective boards of directors, and the Federation of French Alliances as Chairman of the Board of Directors.

He is also a member of the American Council on Education's Commission on Education and International Affairs, and the Council on Foreign Relations. In addition, he serves on the advisory committee of the American-European Foundation and the American Community School of Paris, and is the IIE representative of the U. S. Mission to the United Nations.

He has been appointed by President Eisenhower to serve as a member of the National Advisory Committee on Inter-American Affairs and has been awarded the French Legion of Honor.

Can the American Economy Adjust to Arms Control?

The following Joint Statement has been adopted by the National Planning Association's Board of Trustees and Standing Committees on Agriculture, Business, Labor, and International Policy. Approved at NPA's 25th Anniversary Meeting in Washington, D. C., October 23, 1959, the Statement was submitted to full Committee membership for endorsement. A list of the 91 signers follows the Statement.

THE NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION has repeatedly stated that the American economy is productive enough to afford those national security programs which may be needed both to deter a major attack and to prevent "local" incidents. We believe it is of equal importance to emphasize that the American economy can also stand substantial arms reduction.

Current negotiations related to world arms limitations may or may not lead to dependable international controls and reduced military budgets. We will argue in this statement that plans should be developed for dealing with the economic consequences of material arms reductions.

These considerations are intended to establish that there is no valid *economic* argument that arms reduction would bring about economic depression. The potential increase in nondefense supply of goods and services due to economic growth could be several times larger than the increase due to a substantial reduction in armaments. In this statement we shall state the reasons why we believe the task is manageable and enumerate four phases which we believe require detailed study and planning.

1. Let us assume that an agreement providing for substantial arms reduction could become effective, for instance, five years from now. We are now spending \$46 billion per year for national security. Within a five-year period, with no change in present programs, this amount may well exceed \$50 billion annually (in present prices). Even a total disarmament would not mean that these \$50 billion would disappear entirely from the budget. There would be expenditures for the liquidation of contractual obligations. Quite possibly a national and an international police force would be established which would require financial support. And in all likelihood there would be substantial expenditures for international inspection and control machinery.

At present there are large expenditures classified under national security which would have to be continued and perhaps increased in the event of arms reduction. National security expenditures now include roughly \$5 billion per year in support of research and development activities. This represents almost 90 percent of all Federal research expenditures and more than half of all research outlays, private and public, in the United States. Many of these research projects have peacetime aspects and could be reoriented. Also, the whole nuclear energy program (including the nuclear power program) and the mutual

security program are classified as national security expenditures and would be continued, although with a change in emphasis.

Thus, even a comprehensive agreement regarding the reduction of armaments would not mean a complete elimination of what are now termed the national security expenditures from the budget. It would not be unreasonable to assume that with substantial reorientations, such expenditures would be reduced by only one half (to a total of \$25 billion) by 1965.

2. There are a great many urgent programs in fields other than national security in which only slow progress is being made due to budgetary limitations. It has been widely recognized that education, health, and training programs are deficient and that our programs for conservation and development of water and other natural resources do not begin to meet the prospective needs (in part, because of the high cost of national security).

While we have embarked on a comprehensive road construction program, our airports and other air facilities are still far from meeting the requirements of the jet age, not to speak of the rocket age.

The spectacular metropolitan and suburban developments have created manifold problems which require an imaginative approach for which no precedence exists in any of the present programs.

The following tabulation presents estimates of cumulative outlays over a five-year period by Federal, state, and local areas if deficiencies in a few selected areas are to be wiped out and if needed improvements are to be made.

Cumulative Expenditure Requirements for Selected Nondefense Government Programs over the Next Five Years

	(\$ billion)
Education	30
classroom construction	16
current operation	14
Highways and skyways	75
Urban renewal	100
(slum clearance, low cost housing, and community redevelopment)	
Water supply and conservation	60
Health and hospitals	35
Other programs	30
(air pollution, research and development, etc.)	
Total	330

We do not pretend that these estimates are precise. They represent an evaluation of what would be required to overcome existing backlogs, to provide for anticipated needs over the next five years, and to allow for essential improvements in these program areas. The estimates are based on

reports and studies of private organizations and government agencies for these particular fields. They are quoted to give an idea of the order of magnitude.

Present spending of the Federal, state, and local governments on these programs amounts to about \$30 billion per year. Continuation of this same rate of spending would still leave us at the end of a five-year period with glaring deficiencies. Even assuming continuation of present national security programs some increase in outlays for those nondefense programs would be possible. It may well be that increased spending on all nondefense programs five years hence may rise from the current level of about \$50 billion to almost \$80 billion without any substantial reduction in armaments. With arms reduction, total nondefense outlays may well be increased to \$90 billion. Reduction in armaments, therefore, would make it possible to devote \$10 billion per year more to those purposes where serious deficiencies exist than would be possible if present defense programs had to be continued. Of the \$25 billion reduction in national security expenditures, \$10 billion might be offset by an increase in highly desirable, nondefense related programs.

3. There is a possibility that arms reduction might be associated with a greatly expanded program for credits and technical assistance in support of foreign economic development. Such support may, in part, take the form, not of offsetting budget expenditures, but possibly of an increase in public or private capital export. We have no basis for estimating a particular magnitude for such an item but the possibility of such an increase in outlays offsetting a part of the reduction in defense spending should be kept in mind.

4. After reorientation of some of the national security programs and increases in nondefense programs, \$15 billion would be left for increases in private expenditures. Our projections of private expenditures for individual consumption, domestic business investment, and capital export in 1965 (assuming continuation of present national security programs) amount to \$500 billion. Therefore, a 3 percent increase in these private expenditures would be needed to bring about a complete offset for the reduction in armament spending. Considering that the total Federal, state, and local budgets would be reduced by \$15 billion, a tax reduction of about 7 percent would become feasible. There seems to be little question that with tax reduction an increase in private spending or capital investments would be very likely. Assuming that the whole amount would be available for additional consumer spending, this would make a difference of 2 percent between spendable income, with and without disarmament in 1965.

If politically feasible, a reduction in armament would be highly desirable economically. It would allow the shift of resources from defense production and defense services to urgent peacetime tasks, and would permit tax reduction along with the resulting increase in greater consumer satisfaction. However, the magnitude, seen in the perspective of the economy as a whole, should not be exaggerated. With a satisfactory rate of growth (let us say 4 percent per year) production of goods and services in 1965 should be more than \$100 billion (in present dollars) above present levels. This means that with defense expenditures remain-

ing at present levels, \$100 billion will be available for additional consumption, business investment, or nondefense government services. With a reduction in national security expenditures as detailed in this statement, the possible increase in these goods and services would not be \$100 billion but \$125 billion. But, economic growth would lead to an increase in the potential supply of nondefense goods and services several times larger than the increase resulting from a substantial reduction in armaments.

This reasoning should not be interpreted, however, as suggesting that the transition from an armament race to disarmament would be an easy matter. First, our estimates imply shifts of production from one industry to other industries, often also from one region to another with all the ensuing problems of readjustment. These shifts will not come about easily. We need a careful exploration of the areas in which high priority government programs could take the place of defense procurement and defense employment. There should be advance planning in each of the crucial areas in order to prevent hardship and serious dislocations. There should be consideration as to which of these programs could best be done by the Federal government, which best by state and local governments. Also the problem of tax resources would require consideration. A reduction in defense spending might permit Federal tax reduction while a considerable part of the increase in nondefense programs might be in areas which were under the traditional jurisdiction of state and local governments.

Some people may feel that disarmament is such a remote possibility that it is not worthwhile to spend any effort in that direction. To that we answer that none of this work would be in vain. In a period of protracted high level armament we must make some progress on these non-defense programs anyway. The main difference is merely one of the speed with which we can proceed.

Moreover, unless we have a convincing economic plan for disarmament we cannot forcefully answer the argument that we fear arms reduction because it may cause a breakdown of our economic system. In the contest between the rival economic, social, and political systems, at times the threat of increased armament will be used, at times the promise of disarmament will be used and has been used. Competitive coexistence requires us to be prepared for both strategies.

Members of the Board of Trustees and Standing Committees Signing the Statement

H. CHRISTIAN SONNE Chairman of the Board; President, South Ridge Corporation	OTIS BRUBAKER Director, Research Dept., United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO
FRANK ALTSCHUL Chairman of the Board, General American Investors Company	ROBERT K. BUCK Waukegan, Iowa
STANLEY ANDREWS Executive Director, National Project in Agricultural Communications, Michigan State College	HARRY A. BULLIS Minneapolis, Minnesota
JOHN A. BAKER Director, Legislative Services, National Farmers Union	T. C. CARROLL President-Emeritus, Brotherhood of Maintenance Way Employees, AFL-CIO
SOLOMON BARKIN Director of Research, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO	JACOB CLAYMAN International Representative, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO
WILLIAM L. BATT Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	HARLAN CLEVELAND Dean, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University
J. A. BEIRNE President, Communications Workers of America	MYRON M. COWEN Washington, D. C.
MURRAY R. BENEDICT Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of California	THOMAS CRAVEN Washington, D. C.
D. BOWMAN Crown Zellerbach Corporation	HARRY W. CULBRETH Vice President, Nationwide Insurance
J. A. BROWNLOW President, Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO	AUGUST DAHME Aberdeen, South Dakota
	ROBERT W. DOWLING President, City Investing Company

MRS. KATHERINE ELLICKSON
Assistant Director, Dept. of Social Security, AFL-CIO

GUY EMERSON
Samuel H. Kress Foundation

GROVER W. EMSLEY
Executive Vice President, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks

RAY EPPERT
President, Burroughs Corporation

ARVAL L. ERIKSON
Economic Advisor, Oscar Mayer & Company

ROBERT FAEGRE
President, Minnesota and Ontario Paper Company

JOSEPH FICHTER
Farm Consultant, Oxford, Ohio

SANDER GENIS
Manager, Minnesota Joint Board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America

PAUL S. GEOT
President, The Pillsbury Company

CARTER GOODRICH
Professor of Economics, Columbia University

W. E. HAMILTON
Director of Research, American Farm Bureau Federation

J. B. S. HARDMAN
New York, New York

RUFUS C. HARRIS
President, Mercer University

A. F. HARTUNG
International President, International Woodworkers of America, AFL-CIO

ALBERT HAYES
International President, International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO

LELAND HAZARD
Director-Consultant, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company

AUGUST HECKSCHER
Director, The Twentieth Century Fund

OSCAR HELINE
Marcus, Iowa

H. STRUVE HENSEL
Washington, D. C.

A. C. HOFFMAN
Vice President, Kraft Foods

H. M. HORNER
Chairman of the Board, United Aircraft Corporation

ERIC JOHNSTON
President, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.

DAVID KAPLAN
New York, New York

E. W. KIECKHEFER
Editor & Publisher, The Daily Plainsman

ALAN KIRK
Chairman of the Board, Mercant Corporation

O. A. KNIGHT
President, Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers' International Union

ALBRECHT M. LEDERER
President, A. M. Lederer & Company, Inc.

D. M. LEVITT
President, D.C.A. Food Industries, Inc.

J. L. LOCKE
President, Fisher Flouring Mills Company

T. G. MacGOWAN
Director of Advance Planning, Firestone Tire & Rubber Company

STANLEY MARCUS
President, Neiman-Marcus Company

JOHN K. MESKIMEN
Director, Office of Labor Affairs, International Cooperation Administration

DONALD MURPHY
Director, Editorial Research, Wal-jaces Farmer

GEORGE NEBOLISINE
Coudert Brothers

LOWRY NELSON
Professor of Rural Sociology, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University

WILLIAM H. NICHOLLS
Chairman, Dept. of Economics and Business Administration, Vanderbilt University

R. J. ODEGARD
O. J. Odegard Potato Company

CHARLTON OGBURN
New York, New York

LITHGOW OSBORNE
President, The American-Scandinavian Foundation

CHARLES PALMER
President, Palmer, Inc.

JAMES PATTON
President, National Farmers Union

MILES PENNYBACKER
President, Voltare Tubes, Inc.

ERIC PETERSON
Bradenton, Florida

CHARLES PHILLIPS
President, Bates College

CLARENCE PICKETT
Honorary Secretary, American Friends Service Committee, Inc.

EMIL RIEVE
Chairman of the Executive Council, Textile Workers' Union of America, AFL-CIO

BEARDSLEY RUMML
New York, New York

STANLEY RUTTENBERG
Director, Department of Research, AFL-CIO

ADOLPH SCHMIDT
Vice President, T. Mellon and Sons

JAMES SCHRAMM
Vice President, J. S. Schramm Company

TED F. SILVEY
AFL-CIO Research Department

FRED SMITH
Vice President, The Prudential Insurance Company of America

LAUREN SOTH
Editor of the Editorial Pages, The Des Moines Register and Tribune.

CHARLES SYMINGTON
Chairman of the Executive Committee, Symington Wayne Corp.

WAYNE CHATFIELD TAYLOR
Heathsville, Virginia

LAZARE TEPPER
Director, Research Dept., International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL-CIO

FLETCHER WALLER
Vice President, Bell & Howell

J. CARLTON WARD, JR.
President, Vitro Corporation of America

RALPH WATKINS
Director of Economic Studies, Brookings Institution

WILLIAM WAYMACK
Adel, Iowa

GEORGE WEAVER
Assistant to the President, International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL-CIO

FRANK WELCH
Dean, College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky

WALTER WHEELER
President, Pitney Bowes, Inc.

ROBERT WHITNEY
President, Marketing Audits Institute

DAVID WILLIAMS
Director, Research & Education, Americans for Democratic Action

DAVID WILLIAMSON
Chesertown, Maryland

DAVID WINTON
Chairman of the Board, Winton Lumber Company

OBEY WYUM
Rutland, North Dakota

RALPH YOHE
Editor, The Wisconsin Agriculturist

ARNOLD ZANDER
International President, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO

Financing Higher Education

In observance of its 50th Anniversary, McGraw-Hill has recently published a study of the economics of higher education in the United States, *Financing Higher Education, 1960-1970*. The study, a result of collaboration between educators and foundation executives, covers such topics as the broad issues involved in financing higher education, the role of research in the economics of universities, the cooperation between colleges and business firms, the more efficient management of curriculum and plant, sources of financial support, the financial needs of students, and the role of the government in education.

Dr. Philip H. Coombs, one of the twelve contributors to the study, examines higher education from an economist's point of view. Dr. Coombs, Secretary to the Fund for the Advancement of Education, states that although "higher volume in most industries means lower unit costs and larger profits," in "higher education larger volume promises larger deficits and possibly poorer quality."

Three factors, he states, which contribute to rising costs in education are: (1) the expansion of services, both academic and nonacademic, which the colleges now provide—for example, guidance and physical education; (2) the general rise in labor costs in this labor-intensive type of organization; and (3) general built-in inefficiencies such as practices which result in low utilization of plant and low productivity of faculty.

In order to close the financial gap between education expenditures and revenues, Dr. Coombs points out the various needs of the present system of higher education which must be met, as well as changes which the colleges must make, in order to solve their financial dilemma.

First, Dr. Coombs states, there is a need to develop ingenious new arrangements, by which education may tap

the nation's capital funds on a parity with industry. There are signs, however, that private banks and insurance companies are beginning to view the colleges as a promising field for investment, and that college trustees are modifying their traditional aversion to borrowing.

Also, a change must be made in college accounting systems, which he declared are archaic. The present systems are geared to the purposes of auditing, not of effective financial management or decision making by college administrators, states the author. This general lack of adequate financial information points out another need in the higher educational system, that of better and more fact-finding tools for decision making. Administrators are generally insufficiently aware of changes which have occurred over time in the internal use of resources, the composition of their student body and faculty, and the quality and character of their services. Thus, effective management is hindered.

Another contributor to the study, Harold F. Clark, Professor in Charge of Educational Economics at Columbia University's Teachers College, surveys four systems of education which fall outside of the regular historic system of education. These are: (1) the education offered by industry; (2) the educational programs of organizations, for example, the educational programs of churches; (3) the educational programs carried on by individuals, for example, correspondence courses; and (4) the programs of education and training of the military.

In view of these numerous "outside" educational programs, Dr. Clark declares that it would be reasonable to assume that the United States is not a nation of ninth- or tenth-graders as has been frequently stated, but that 151½ years of education "would be closer to the real situation."

Looking Ahead

If you enjoy this issue, why not become a regular reader of *Looking Ahead*. Simply fill in the form below, mail to the National Planning Association, 1606 New Hampshire Ave., N. W., Washington 9, D. C., and become an Associate Member of NPA. For only \$5.00 a year you will receive ten issues of *Looking Ahead*, plus a 25% discount on all NPA publications—past or future—as well as special announcements of NPA's new publications.

Name _____

☐

Bill me later

Address _____

☐

Check enclosed

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

He also declares that if we included the total cost of our various systems of education, that we may very well spend 9 or 10 percent, not 3 or 4 percent, of our national income on education.

Dr. Clark concludes that the American public will undoubtedly be willing to give adequate financial support for post-high school education, if, all of the facts, opportunities, and advantages are presented to them.

NPA National Council Member, John D. Millett, was also a contributor to the 50th Anniversary study. Dr. Millett, President of Miami University, Ohio, discusses the pros and cons of raising student charges to more closely meet actual operating costs. He concludes that the best interests of the nation will be served, however, by gradual and moderate tuition increases, and that it is too early "for college and university presidents to put away their begging bowls." Surely, he adds, the present financial struggle, "is a small price to pay for a free educational system in a free society!"

Dr. Millett is the author of "Expansion of College Facilities: Problems of Finance and Organization," which appeared in *Looking Ahead*, January 1956.

(*Financing Higher Education, 1960-1970*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York: 1959, 312 pp.)

NPA REPORTS, in addition to LOOKING AHEAD, are sent automatically to members of the Association. For information on membership, available publications and reports, write NPA Membership Department. LOOKING AHEAD is published 10 times a year. Permission is granted to quote from or reprint specific articles, unless otherwise stipulated, provided credit is given to LOOKING AHEAD and the National Planning Association.

NPA PUBLICATION STAFF

Editor of Publications: Eugene H. Bland

Editorial Consultant: Virginia D. Parker

Associate Editor: Bermen Chang

Assistant Editor: Constance Pierson

Assistant Editor: Lynn Ray Hoopes

NPA OFFICERS: Chairman, H. Christopher Jones; Chairman, Executive Committee, Wayne Chatfield Taylor; Vice Chairman, Frank Althaus; Clifton S. Golds, Leonard Hazard, Secretaries, Evelyn Larson & Beth; Secretary, Arnold S. Zander; Treasurer, Charles J. Symington; Counsel, Myron M. Cowen; Assistant Chairman and Executive Secretary, John Miller.

looking
ahead

NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION

1606 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington 9, D. C.
Telephone: Columbia 5-7685 Cable: NATPLAN

Vol. 8, No. 2



March 1960

Form 3547 Requested



Non Profit Org.
U. S. POSTAGE

Paid

Washington, D. C.
Permit No. 1819

